

I am submitting comments in follow-up to the above-referenced informational meeting regarding locating wind towers on state land.

1) regarding land of Fisheries and Wildlife, much of this land was bought with sportsmen's money. An extra \$5 is tacked on to every hunting and fishing license for land acquisition. I have heard figures ranging from 100 yards to 500 yards will be fenced off around each tower to prevent injury from any arm that may fly off. That ranges from 6-1/2 to 162 acres per wind tower. As I believe more than one tower will be located per site, presumably spaced equally apart to prevent any tower from being damaged by said arm flying off, the acres affected just by fencing off might be a majority of the acreage of one half, or more, of the WMAs in the Western District. Of the 26 WMAs for which acreage is given, 9 are less than 500 acres and an additional 4 are less than 1000 acres. Add on top the additional destruction of undeveloped land to put in roads for the towers, and the effect on wildlife will be astronomical. Using F&W lands for the wind towers is totally unacceptable. I believe any use of F&W land for wind towers would be an eminent domain taking by one division within EEA from another division within EEA.

2) I am not opposed to wind towers on other state lands, provided they do not preclude the use for which the land was acquired. DCR land is either conservation and/or recreation. Recreation would still be available, but conservation certainly would not.

3) I would rather see the huge subsidies from the commonwealth which would go to the developers and ultimately into the developers' pockets go instead to direct conservation of energy use, through education, free light bulbs, free home energy audits, etc.

Thank you. Ginny Akabane